07-31-06

IFW

JUL 2 8 2006

Signature

Date

Printed name

Jonathan P. Osha

July 28, 2006

22511 PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 10/574,825 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL April 6, 2006 First Named Inventor **FORM** Atsushi Takahashi Art Unit N/A (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Examiner Name Not Yet Assigned Attorney Docket Number Total Number of Pages in This Submission 07200/077001 ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication Drawing(s) Fee Transmittal Form Appeal Communication to Board of Fee Attached Licensing-related Papers Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC Amendment/Reply (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a After Final Proprietary Information Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Affidavits/declaration(s) Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please х Extension of Time Request Terminal Disclaimer Identify below): International Preliminary Report on **Express Abandonment Request** Request for Refund Patentability and Translation of Written Opinion of the International CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Searching Authority Return Receipt Postcard Certified Copy of Priority Landscape Table on CD Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Remarks Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name OSHA LIANG LLP

Reg. No.

33.986



Application No. (if known): 10/574,825

Attorney Docket No.: 07200/077001

## **Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV804197937US in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on <u>July 28, 2006</u> Date 22511

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Fam Lennessed	
/ Signature	
Kim Hennessey	
Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate	<del>.</del>
(713) 22	28-8600
	e Number

Note:

Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Transmittal (1 page)

International Preliminary Report on Patentability and Translation of Written

Opinion of the International Searching Authority (7 pages)

Postcard

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# **PCT**

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference FP04-0307-00	FOR FURTHER ACTION	Priority date (day/month/year) 07 October 2003 (07.10.2003)	
International application No. PCT/JP2004/014865	International filing date (day/month/year) 07 October 2004 (07.10.2004)		
International Patent Classification (8th See relevant information in Form F	h edition unless older edition indicated) PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant NAGASE & CO., LTD.			

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).		
<u>2</u> .	In the attached sheets, any refer	al of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.  rence to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.	
3.	This report contains indications	s relating to the following items:	
	Box No. I	Basis of the report	
	Box No. II	Priority	
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application	
4.	The International Bureau will not, except where the applican date (Rule 44bis .2).	communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but at makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority	
		Date of issuance of this report 20 June 2006 (20.06.2006)	

Authorized officer

Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 10

Masashi Honda

Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35 Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes

1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

	PA	TENT COOPER	ATION TREA	ry Ra	
From the INTERNATIONAL SEAR	CUINC AUTHOR	ITV		TVc.	
To:	CHING AUTHOR			PCT PCT	ン
				TITTEN OPINION OF THE SONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY	
				(PCT Rule 43bis.1)	
			Date of mailing (day/month/year)		
Applicant's or agent's file r	eference		FOR FURTHER	ACTION	
FP04-0307-0	0			See paragraph 2 below	
International application N	0.	International filing date (	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
PCT/JP2004/	014865	07.10.2004		07.10.2003	
International Patent Classic	fication (IPC) or bot	h national classification an	d IPC		•
NAGASE & CO	., LTD.		v		
1. This opinion con	tains indications rela	ting to the following items	s:		
Box No.	I Basis of the	opinion			
Box No.		•			
Box No.	-	ishment of opinion with re	gard to novelty, invent	ive step and industrial applicability	
Box No.	IV Lack of uni	ty of invention			
Box No.		tatement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> y: citations and explanatio		novelty, inventive step or industrial	
Box No.	•••	ruments cited			
Box No.	VII Certain def	ects in the international ap	plication		
Box No.	VIII Certain obs	ervations on the internatio	nal application		
International Pre than this one to this International If this opinion is written reply to PCT/ISA/220 or For further option	r international preli- liminary Examining be the IPEA and the I Searching Authorit s. as provided above gether, where appro-	Authority ("IPEA") except chosen IPEA has notified y will not be so considered to be a written priate, with amendments, not 22 months from the property of the principal of 22 months from the property of 22 months from	of that this does not apply the International Bur l. en opinion of the IPE/ before the expiration	If be considered to be a written opinion of ply where the applicant chooses an Authority of eau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinion.  A the applicant is invited to submit to the IPE of 3 months from the date of mailing of F expires later.	other as of EA a
Name and mailing address	s of the ISA/JP		Authorized officer		

Telephone No.

Facsimile No.

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/JP2004/014865

Box	No. I	Busis of this optnion
1.	With	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was , unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
		. which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under
		Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With inve	n regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed intion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	type of material
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	format of material
		in written format
ı		in computer readable form
	c.	time of filing/furnishing
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	Add	litional comments:
Ì		
1		

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/014865

Bo			ile 43bis I(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; porting such statement	
1.	Statement			
	Novelty (N)	Claims	1-20	YES
		Claims		NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims	7, 8, 11, 15-20	YES
		Claims	1-6, 9, 10, 12-14	NO
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-20	YES
		Claims		МО

#### 2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP, 9-266183, A (Texas Instruments Japan Ltd.), 7 October, 1997 (07.10.97)
Document 2: JP, 2002-265888, A (Hitachi Chemical Co., Ltd.), 18 September, 2002 (18.09.02)
Document 3: JP, 2002-353252, A (Hitachi Chemical Co., Ltd.), 6 Dumber, 2002 (06.1202)
Document 4: JP, 9-263734, A (Texas Instruments Japan Ltd.), 7 October, 1997 (07.10.97)

The subject matter of claim 1 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. With regard to the adhesive described in document 1, a person skilled in the art could have easily conceived the idea of adjusting the range of viscosity of the adhesive at the time of pasting by taking into consideration the prevention of airspace and excess runoff of adhesive suggested in [0028] of document 2.

The subject matters of claims of claims 2 and 3 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 3 and 4 cited in the international search. A person skilled in the art could have easily conceived the idea of (1) regarding the adhesive provided on the back side of a wafer described in document 3 as referring to the description of document 1 or that of document 4 and (2) adjusting the range of viscosity of the adhesive at the time of pasting by taking into consideration the prevention of airspace and excess runoff of adhesive suggested in [0028] of document 2.

The subject matter of claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1-4. Setting the time for peeling off the carrier film 2 described in document 3 from the adhesive just before sticking a wafer to a dicing film is a mere matter of design variation. Therefore, a person skilled in the art could have easily conceived of this idea.

The subject matter of claim 5 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 2 and 4. With regard to the adhesive described in document 1, a person skilled in the art could have easily conceived the idea of adjusting the range of viscosity of adhesive at the time of pasting by taking into consideration the prevention of airspace and excess runoff of adhesive suggested in [0028] of document 2.

The subject matters of claims 6, 9 and 10 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1-4. In each case, a person skilled in the art could have easily conceived the idea of adjusting the range of viscosity of adhesive at the time of pasting by taking into consideration the prevention of airspace and excess runoff of adhesive implied in [0028] of document 2.

The subject matter of claim 12 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1-4. Document 1 or 4 describes that the adhesion process is completed by using a semi-hardened thermosetting polyimede resin for temporary bonding a wafer to a dicing film, then heat

2006年 7月12日 15時20分

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/JP2004/014865

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; Box No. V citations and explanations supporting such statement

hardening the said resin to turn the bonded layer into a polyimede. A person skilled in the art could have easily conceived the idea of carrying out this heat hardening process after the mounting process.

The subject matter of claim 13 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1-4. Although document 1 or 4 describes that a wafer is temporarily bonded to a dicing film by using a thermosetting type of adhesive as a semi-hardened material, it can be judged that essentially the bonding is in the form of a film.

The subject matter of claim 14 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1-4. [0038] of document 1 or [0022] of document 4 wherein a dicing saw is explained with examples.

Since none of the documents cited in the ISR describe the subject matters of claims 7 and 8, 11, 15-20, particularly the point that a thermosetting type adhesive does not react to thermosetting at the time of pasting, the said subject matters are non-obvious to a person skilled in the art.

., , 2006年 7月12日 15時21分

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/014865

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application			
The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:			
The phrase "fabricating IC chips with adhesion from a wafer" described on page 1 [0001] should be "fabricating IC chips with adhesive from a wafer."			
•			

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTIIORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/014865

Box No. VIII

Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

It is prescribed in claims 1-20 that at the pasting temperature the thermosetting adhesive have a viscosity of 20,000 Pa•s or below, but in terms of the pros and cons of the prior art described in, for example, [0028] of patent publication No. 2002-265888, generally speaking, the pressure and time of pasting are regarded as factors that should not be ignored when trying to realize the adhesion between IC chip and adhesive without creating airspace. However, claims 1-20 relate to inventions that do not take into consideration these factors, so that the descriptions in claims 1-20 are not enough to prove their sufficiency for acquiring the desired effect of "preventing the appearance of a void." Consequently, claims 1-20 are not sufficiently backed up by the description.